APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,589	05/31/2001	Sowmya Subramanian	262/118	2629

55498   7590   07/21/2008
ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
c/o VISTA IP LAW GROUP LLP
1885 LUNDY AVENUE
SUITE 108
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 95131

EXAMINER
STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/872,589	SUBRAMANIAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KYLE R. STORK	2178	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

> A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
> WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
>   after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
> - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
> - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
>   Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
>   earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 May 2008</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-19,21-91 and 95-98</u> is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-19,21-91 and 97</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) <u>95,96 and 98</u> is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
       1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
       2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
       3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
          application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This non-final office action is in response to the RCE and the amendment filed 28
May 2008.

2.   Claims 1-19, 21-91, and 95-98 are pending. Claims 1, 23, 49, 58, 63, 70, and 71
are independent claims.

        The rejection of claims 95-98 under 35 USC 103 over Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly,
and further in view of Breslau et al. (US 5765205, patented 9 June 1998) has been
withdrawn in view of the applicant's remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

4.   Claims 23-48, and 97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed
invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

        As per independent claim 23, the applicant discloses a system for prefabricating
information comprising a prefabricator and an interceptor (claim 23, lines 2 and 9). The
prefabricator and interceptor appear to be software components of the system
(Specification: paragraphs 0007-0009 and 0028). The applicant has therefore claimed
a software system. As such, the claim fails to fall within a statutory category, as it is

neither a machine, manufacture, composition of matter, nor a process. Therefore, claim

23 is directed toward non-statutory subject matter, and thus rejected.

Dependent claims 24-48 and 97 fail to cure the deficiencies of the system of

claim 23. Therefore, claims 24-48 and 97 are rejected using a similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1-3, 7-8, 10-11, 13-15, 21-27, 30-32, 34-35, 37-57, 63, 65, 67-68, 70-72,

75, 77-78, 80-89, and 91 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Heddaya et al. (US 6205481, filed 17 March 1998, hereafter Heddaya) in further

view of Smith et al. (US 6742033, filed 12 June 2000, hereafter Smith) and Ganguly et

al. (US 6629132, filed 20 September 1999, hereafter Ganguly).

As per independent claim 1 Heddaya discloses a method for prefabricating an

information page, comprising:

- Prefabricating a first page in accordance with a definable prefabrication

  policy to produce a first prefabrication page (column 7, lines 10-11)

- Receiving an information request (column 7, lines18-24)

- Determining if the information request corresponds to the first page (column 7, lines 24-27)

- Dynamically fabricating a second page if the information request corresponds to the second page (column 7, lines 42-45)

Heddaya fails to disclose the method wherein the prefabrication is not in response to a request for the first page by a user. However, Smith discloses the method of prefabrication of a page wherein the prefabrication is not in response to a request for the first page by a user (Figures 3 and 4; column 5, line 56- column 6, line 18: Here, the pages to prefabricate are based upon pages that a user frequently visits. A page prefabrication is then scheduled for a specific time and the page is prefabricated without a user requesting the prefabricated page).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya's method of prefabrication with Smith's method of prefabrication, since it would have allowed a user to save server access time, conserve cache space, and reduce the risk of conflicting with the user's use of the telephone (Smith: column 5, lines 60-62).

Heddaya further fails to specifically disclose sending a request for information of the page, wherein the request is transmitted at a rate based on system resource information. However, Smith discloses sending a request for information of the page, wherein the request is transmitted at a rate based on system resource information (column 6, lines 19-60: Here, the user's system monitors a user's requests for data. Based upon the timing of the request, the system sends requests for data, and pre-

caches the requested data when a user's phone is not being used, thereby avoiding interference with in coming or out going phone calls. This increases the transmission rate of obtaining the data, as the information request is less likely to be interrupted by phone traffic). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Smith with Heddaya, since it would have allowed a user to obtain often viewed pages more quickly.

Further, Heddaya and Smith fail to specifically disclose the method wherein the act of prefabrication the page comprises querying a database to obtained cached data, processing the data received from the database, and packaging the information associated with the data in a prescribed format. However, Ganguly discloses the method wherein the act of prefabrication the page comprises querying a database to obtained cached data, processing the data received from the database, and packaging the information associated with the data in a prescribed format (Figure 3, column 7, lines 27-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya and Smith's method with Ganguly's method, since it would have allowed a user to more quickly access data.

As per dependent claim 2 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses a method:

- Determining if the first prefabrication page is stale (column 3, lines 49-51)

- Dynamically fabricating the first page if the first prefabricated page is stale (column 3, lines 57-59)

As per dependent claim 3 Heddaya , Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 3 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses a method where a time factor is considered in determining whether the first prefabricated page is stale (column 3, lines 60-62).

As per dependent claim 7 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the method where a system resource level is considered before schedule the action of page prefabrication (column 8, lines 5-13; column 8, lines 20-28).

As per dependent claim 8 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 7 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the method in which the system resource level is a resource measure selected from the group consisting of: CPU usage level, memory usage level, and number of pending prefabrication requests (column 8, lines 20-49).

As per dependent claim 10 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the method in which the definable prefabrication policy identifies pages to prefabricate (column 3, lines 52-64).

As per dependent claim 11 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 10 and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Heddaya further discloses the method in which the definable prefabrication policy comprises a responsibility parameter (column 8, lines 34-49).

As per dependent claim 13 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 10 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the method in which the definable prefabrication policy comprises a scheduling parameter (column 3, lines 60-62). Here, the update of material can be either "periodically or at a scheduled update time." Both of these options disclose definable prefabrication policy.

As per dependent claim 14 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 10 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the method in which the definable prefabrication policy comprises a refresh rate parameter (column 3, lines 60-62). In this instance, the updated material can be refreshed at a "scheduled update time" which is a refresh rate parameter.

As per dependent claim 15 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the method in which auto-tuning of the prefabrication step is performed to minimize interference with other system workload (column 4, lines 22-43).

As per dependent claim 21 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the method where the first page is a browser page (Figure 1; column 6, lines 10-18).

As per dependent claim 22 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the method in which the first prefabricated page is cached (column 3, lines 29-33).

As per independent claim 23 Heddaya discloses a system for prefabricating information comprising:

- A prefabricator to manage prefabricating a first page to prefabricate a first prefabricated page (column 7, lines 10-11)

- An interceptor to intercept and information request (Figure 1; column 7, lines 24-27), the interceptor logically interposed between a user interface and a computer application (Figure 1; column 7, lines 18-27), the interceptor providing a first prefabricated page if the information request corresponds to the first page and dynamically fabricating a second page if the information request corresponds to the second page (column 7, lines 39-45)

Heddaya fails to disclose the system wherein the prefabrication is not in response to a request for the first page by a user. However, Smith discloses the system of prefabrication of a page wherein the prefabrication is not in response to a request for the first page by a user (Figures 3 and 4; column 5, line 56- column 6, line 18: Here, the pages to prefabricate are based upon pages that a user frequently visits. A page prefabrication is then scheduled for a specific time and the page is prefabricated without a user requesting the prefabricated page).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya's system of prefabrication with Smith's system of prefabrication, since it would have allowed a user to save server access time, conserve cache space, and reduce the risk of conflicting with the user's use of the telephone (Smith: column 5, lines 60-62).

Heddaya further fails to specifically disclose sending a request for information of the page, wherein the request is transmitted at a rate based on system resource information. However, Smith discloses sending a request for information of the page, wherein the request is transmitted at a rate based on system resource information (column 6, lines 19-60: Here, the user's system monitors a user's requests for data. Based upon the timing of the request, the system sends requests for data, and pre-caches the requested data when a user's phone is not being used, thereby avoiding interference with in coming or out going phone calls. This increases the transmission rate of obtaining the data, as the information request is less likely to be interrupted by phone traffic). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Smith with Heddaya, since it would have allowed a user to obtain often viewed pages more quickly.

Further, Heddaya and Smith fail to specifically disclose the method wherein the act of prefabrication the page comprises querying a database to obtained cached data, processing the data received from the database, and packaging the information associated with the data in a prescribed format. However, Ganguly discloses the method wherein the act of prefabrication the page comprises querying a database to

obtained cached data, processing the data received from the database, and packaging

the information associated with the data in a prescribed format (Figure 3; column 7,

lines 27-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya and Smith's method with Ganguly's

method, since it would have allowed a user to more quickly access data.

As per dependent claim 24 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the

limitations similar to those in claim 23 and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Heddaya further discloses the system in which the prefabricator comprises a module to

identify pages to prefabricate (column 3, lines 52-64).

As per dependent claim 25 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the

limitations similar to those in claim 23 and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Heddaya further discloses the system in which the prefabricator comprises a module to

prioritize a list of pages to prefabricate (column 8, lines 40-43).

As per dependent claim 26 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the

limitations similar to those in claim 25 and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Heddaya further discloses the system in which the module prioritizes pages based upon

a system resource parameter (column 8, lines 34-49).

As per dependent claim 27 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the

limitations similar to those in claim 25 and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Heddaya further discloses the system in which the module prioritizes the list of pages

based upon a page prefabrication time parameter (Figure 10A; Figure 10B; Figure 11;

column 15, lines 9-50, specifically the sections dealing with communication of lists

between servers in order to determine which documents need to be requested from the

main server).

As per dependent claim 30 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the

limitations similar to those in claim 23 and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Heddaya further discloses the system in which the first page corresponds to a page

request, wherein the page request is processed as a second information request to the

interceptor (column 9, line 65- column 10, line15; {SYN} is read as the first information

request and {GET} is read as the second information request}).

As per dependent claim 31 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the

limitations similar to those in claim 30 and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Heddaya further discloses the system in which the prefabricator comprises a module to

determine a number of page requests to concurrently process into prefabricated pages

(column 8, lines 34-49).

As per dependent claim 32 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the

limitations similar to those in claim 31 and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Heddaya further discloses the system in which the number of concurrent page requests

increases when available system resources increase (column 8, lines 34-49).

As per dependent claim 34 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the

limitations similar to those in claim 23 and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Heddaya further discloses the system in which the prefabricator accesses a

prefabrication policy to manage prefabricating the first page (column 3, lines 49-51).

As per dependent claim 35 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 23 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the system in which the user interface comprises a browser (column 6, lines 19-24).

As per dependent claim 37 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 23and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the system in which the interceptor is a web server (column 6, lines 19-24; column 7, lines 24-27).

As per dependent claim 38 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 23 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the system in which the interceptor is a cache server (column 7, lines 24-27).

As per dependent claim 39 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 23 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the system in which the prefabricator comprises a module to monitor system resources (column 8, lines 22-28).

As per dependent claim 40 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 23 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the system in which the prefabricator and the interceptor are logically associates with a first network node, wherein the system further comprised:

- A second prefabricator and a second interceptor logically associated with a second network node (Figure 1; column 14, lines 1-7).

As per dependent claim 41 Heddaya and Smith discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 40 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the system in which the routing component routes information requests among the first and second network nodes (Figure 1; column 14, lines 1-7).

As per dependent claim 42 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 40 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the system in which a load distributor distributes a prefabrication workload among the first and second network nodes (column 8, lines 34-49).

As per dependent claim 43 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 42 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the system in which the prefabrication workload is distributed based upon system resource levels at the first and second nodes (column 8, lines 34-49).

As per dependent claim 44 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 43 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the system in which a node is assigned a share of the prefabrication workload based on a resource level of the node (column 8, lines 34-49).

As per dependent claim 45 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 43 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the system in which the first and second network nodes are

assigned work from the prefabricated workload in a coordinated manner (column 8, lines 34-49).

As per dependent claim 46 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 43 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the system in which the first and second network nodes are assigned work from the prefabricated workload in a coordinated manner (column 8, lines 34-49).

As per dependent claim 47 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 40 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the system in which the prefabricated pages are stored in a network accessible storage device (column 6, lines 7-9).

As per dependent claim 48 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 23 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the system which is non-intrusively implemented with an existing computer application such that code changes are not preformed against the existing computer application (column 9, lines 57-60; column 11, lines 40-51).

As per independent claim 49 Heddaya discloses a method for prefabricating information pages comprising:

- Prefabricating a first page on a first node to produce a first prefabricated page (column 7, lines 10-11)

- Storing the first prefabricated page (column 7, lines 10-11)

- Prefabricating a second page on a second node to produce a second prefabricated page (column 7, lines 10-11; column 6, lines 7-9)

- Storing the second prefabricated page (column 7, lines 10-11; column 6, lines 7-9)

- Receiving an information request (column 7, lines18-24)

- Providing the first prefabricated page if the information request corresponds to the first page (column 7, lines 24-27)

- Providing the second prefabricated page if the information request corresponds to the second page (column 7, lines 24-27; column 6, lines 6-9)

Heddaya fails to disclose the method wherein the prefabrication is not in response to a request for the first page by a user. However, Smith discloses the method of prefabrication of a page wherein the prefabrication is not in response to a request for the first page by a user (Figures 3 and 4; column 5, line 56- column 6, line 18: Here, the pages to prefabricate are based upon pages that a user frequently visits. A page prefabrication is then scheduled for a specific time and the page is prefabricated without a user requesting the prefabricated page).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya's method of prefabrication with Smith's method of prefabrication, since it would have allowed a user to save server access time, conserve cache space, and reduce the risk of conflicting with the user's use of the telephone (Smith: column 5, lines 60-62).

Heddaya further fails to specifically disclose sending a request for information of the page, wherein the request is transmitted at a rate based on system resource information. However, Smith discloses sending a request for information of the page, wherein the request is transmitted at a rate based on system resource information (column 6, lines 19-60: Here, the user's system monitors a user's requests for data. Based upon the timing of the request, the system sends requests for data, and pre-caches the requested data when a user's phone is not being used, thereby avoiding interference with in coming or out going phone calls. This increases the transmission rate of obtaining the data, as the information request is less likely to be interrupted by phone traffic). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Smith with Heddaya, since it would have allowed a user to obtain often viewed pages more quickly.

Further, Heddaya and Smith fail to specifically disclose the method wherein the act of prefabrication the page comprises querying a database to obtained cached data, processing the data received from the database, and packaging the information associated with the data in a prescribed format. However, Ganguly discloses the method wherein the act of prefabrication the page comprises querying a database to obtained cached data, processing the data received from the database, and packaging the information associated with the data in a prescribed format (Figure 3; column 7, lines 27-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya and Smith's method with Ganguly's method, since it would have allowed a user to more quickly access data.

As per dependent claim 50 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 49 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the method further comprising:

- Routing the information request to either the first or second node (column 6, lines 40-46)

As per dependent claim 51 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 49 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the method in which the first node accesses the second prefabricated page to satisfy the information request (column 7, lines 52-56; Figure 10A; Figure 10B; Figure 11; column 15, lines 9-50, specifically the sections dealing with communication of lists between servers in order to determine which documents need to be requested from the main server; column 7, lines 24-27).

As per dependent claim 52 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 49 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the method in which the first and second prefabricated pages are stored on a network accessible storage device (column 6, lines 6-9).

As per dependent claim 53 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 52 and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Heddaya further discloses the method in which network accessible storage device comprises a NFS-compliant device (column 6, lines 6-31).

As per dependent claim 54 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 49and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the method in which a prefabrication workload is distributed among the first and second node (column 8, lines 34-49).

As per dependent claim 55 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 54 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the method in which a node is assigned a share of the prefabrication workload based on a resource level of the node (column 8, lines 34-49).

As per dependent claim 56 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 54 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the system in which the node having the lower resource level is assigned a smaller share of the prefabrication workload (column 8, lines 34-49).

As per dependent claim 57 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 54 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the method in which the first and second nodes are assigned work from the prefabricated workload in a coordinated manner (column 8, lines 34-49).

As per independent claim 63 Heddaya discloses obtaining one or more parameters that define how a page should be prefabricated (column 8, lines 34-49). Heddaya fails to disclose the method wherein the prefabrication is not in response to a request for the first page by a user. However, Smith discloses the method of

prefabrication of a page wherein the prefabrication is not in response to a request for

the first page by a user (Figures 3 and 4; column 5, line 56- column 6, line 18: Here, the

pages to prefabricate are based upon pages that a user frequently visits. A page

prefabrication is then scheduled for a specific time and the page is prefabricated without

a user requesting the prefabricated page).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya's method of prefabrication with Smith's

method of prefabrication, since it would have allowed a user to save server access time,

conserve cache space, and reduce the risk of conflicting with the user's use of the

telephone (Smith: column 5, lines 60-62).

Heddaya further fails to specifically disclose sending a request for information of

the page, wherein the request is transmitted at a rate based on system resource

information. However, Smith discloses sending a request for information of the page,

wherein the request is transmitted at a rate based on system resource information

(column 6, lines 19-60: Here, the user's system monitors a user's requests for data.

Based upon the timing of the request, the system sends requests for data, and pre-

caches the requested data when a user's phone is not being used, thereby avoiding

interference with in coming or out going phone calls. This increases the transmission

rate of obtaining the data, as the information request is less likely to be interrupted by

phone traffic). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the applicant's invention to have combined Smith with Heddaya, since it would have

allowed a user to obtain often viewed pages more quickly.

Further, Heddaya and Smith fail to specifically disclose the method wherein the act of prefabrication the page comprises querying a database to obtained cached data, processing the data received from the database, and packaging the information associated with the data in a prescribed format. However, Ganguly discloses the method wherein the act of prefabrication the page comprises querying a database to obtained cached data, processing the data received from the database, and packaging the information associated with the data in a prescribed format (Figure 3; column 7, lines 27-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya and Smith's method with Ganguly's method, since it would have allowed a user to more quickly access data.

As per dependent claim 65 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 63 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the prefabrication policy that is configured to identify pages to prefabricate (column 8, lines 34-49; column 3, lines 49-59).

As per dependent claim 67 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 63 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya further discloses the prefabrication policy comprising a scheduling parameter (column 8, lines 34-49).

As per dependent claim 68 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 63 and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Heddaya further discloses the prefabrication policy comprising a refresh rate parameter
(column 3, lines 49-62).

As per independent claim 70 Heddaya discloses a computer program product
that include a medium usable by a processor having stored thereon a sequence of
instructions which, when executed by said processor, causes said processor to execute
a process for prefabricating an information page, the process comprising:

- Prefabricating a first page in accordance with a definable prefabrication policy to
  produce a first prefabricated page (column 7, lines 10-11)

- Receiving an information request (column 7, lines18-24)

- Determining if the information request corresponds to the first page (column 7,
  lines 24-27)

- Providing the first prefabricated page if the information request corresponds to
  the first page column 7, lines 24-27)

- Dynamically fabricating a second page if the information request corresponds to
  the second page (column 7, lines 42-45)

Heddaya fails to disclose the product wherein the prefabrication is not in
response to a request for the first page by a user. However, Smith discloses the
product of prefabrication of a page wherein the prefabrication is not in response to a
request for the first page by a user (Figures 3 and 4; column 5, line 56- column 6, line
18: Here, the pages to prefabricate are based upon pages that a user frequently visits.
A page prefabrication is then scheduled for a specific time and the page is prefabricated
without a user requesting the prefabricated page).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya's product for prefabrication with Smith's product for prefabrication, since it would have allowed a user to save server access time, conserve cache space, and reduce the risk of conflicting with the user's use of the telephone (Smith: column 5, lines 60-62).

Heddaya further fails to specifically disclose sending a request for information of the page, wherein the request is transmitted at a rate based on system resource information. However, Smith discloses sending a request for information of the page, wherein the request is transmitted at a rate based on system resource information (column 6, lines 19-60: Here, the user's system monitors a user's requests for data. Based upon the timing of the request, the system sends requests for data, and pre-caches the requested data when a user's phone is not being used, thereby avoiding interference with in coming or out going phone calls. This increases the transmission rate of obtaining the data, as the information request is less likely to be interrupted by phone traffic). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Smith with Heddaya, since it would have allowed a user to obtain often viewed pages more quickly.

Further, Heddaya and Smith fail to specifically disclose the method wherein the act of prefabrication the page comprises querying a database to obtained cached data, processing the data received from the database, and packaging the information associated with the data in a prescribed format. However, Ganguly discloses the method wherein the act of prefabrication the page comprises querying a database to

obtained cached data, processing the data received from the database, and packaging

the information associated with the data in a prescribed format (Figure 3; column 7,

lines 27-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya and Smith's method with Ganguly's

method, since it would have allowed a user to more quickly access data.

As per independent claim 71 Heddaya disclose a computer program pr product

that include a medium usable by a processor having stored thereon a sequence of

instructions which, when executed by said processor, causes said processor to execute

a process for prefabricating an information page, the process comprising:

- Prefabricating a first page on a first node to produce a first prefabricated page
  (column 7, lines 10-11)

- Storing the first prefabricated page (column 7, lines 10-11)

- Prefabricating a second page on a second node to produce a second
  prefabricated page (column 7, lines 10-11; column 6, lines 7-9)

- Storing the second prefabricated page (column 7, lines 10-11; column 6, lines 7-
  9)

- Receiving an information request (column 7, lines18-24)

- Providing the first prefabricated page if the information request corresponds to
  the first page (column 7, lines 24-27)

- Providing the second prefabricated page if the information request corresponds
  to the second page (column 7, lines 24-27; column 6, lines 6-9)

Heddaya fails to disclose the product wherein the prefabrication is not in response to a request for the first page by a user. However, Smith discloses the product of prefabrication of a page wherein the prefabrication is not in response to a request for the first page by a user (Figures 3 and 4; column 5, line 56- column 6, line 18: Here, the pages to prefabricate are based upon pages that a user frequently visits. A page prefabrication is then scheduled for a specific time and the page is prefabricated without a user requesting the prefabricated page).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya's product for prefabrication with Smith's product for prefabrication, since it would have allowed a user to save server access time, conserve cache space, and reduce the risk of conflicting with the user's use of the telephone (Smith: column 5, lines 60-62).

Heddaya further fails to specifically disclose sending a request for information of the page, wherein the request is transmitted at a rate based on system resource information. However, Smith discloses sending a request for information of the page, wherein the request is transmitted at a rate based on system resource information (column 6, lines 19-60: Here, the user's system monitors a user's requests for data. Based upon the timing of the request, the system sends requests for data, and pre-caches the requested data when a user's phone is not being used, thereby avoiding interference with in coming or out going phone calls. This increases the transmission rate of obtaining the data, as the information request is less likely to be interrupted by phone traffic). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the applicant's invention to have combined Smith with Heddaya, since it would have allowed a user to obtain often viewed pages more quickly.

Further, Heddaya and Smith fail to specifically disclose the method wherein the act of prefabrication the page comprises querying a database to obtained cached data, processing the data received from the database, and packaging the information associated with the data in a prescribed format. However, Ganguly discloses the method wherein the act of prefabrication the page comprises querying a database to obtained cached data, processing the data received from the database, and packaging the information associated with the data in a prescribed format (Figure 3; column 7, lines 27-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya and Smith's method with Ganguly's method, since it would have allowed a user to more quickly access data.

As per dependent claim 72, Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 70, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant further discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 2. Claim 72 is similarly rejected under Heddaya and Smith.

As per dependent claim 75, Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 70, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant further discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 7. Claim 75 is similarly rejected under Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly.

As per dependent claim 77, Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 70, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant further discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 10. Claim 77 is similarly rejected under Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly.

As per dependent claim 78, Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 70, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant further discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 15. Claim 78 is similarly rejected under Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly.

As per dependent claim 80, Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 70, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant further discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 21. Claim 80 is similarly rejected under Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly.

As per dependent claim 81, Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 70, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant further discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 22. Claim 81 is similarly rejected under Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly.

As per dependent claim 82, Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 70, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Smith further discloses the prefabrication is performed in response to a request initiated by a software, a hardware, or a combination of both (column 5, line 35- column 6, line 8: Here, the system (a combination of hardware and software) initiates the request for content depending upon a users previous activity).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly's method of prefabrication with Smith's method of prefabrication, since it would have allowed a user to save server access time, conserve cache space, and reduce the risk of conflicting with the user's use of the telephone (Smith: column 5, lines 60-62).

As per dependent claim 83, Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 71, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant further discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 41. Claim 83 is similarly rejected under Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly.

As per dependent claim 84, Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 71, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant further discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 51. Claim 84 is similarly rejected under Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly.

As per dependent claim 85, Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 71, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant further discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 52. Claim 85 is similarly rejected under Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly.

As per dependent claim 86, Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 71, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant further discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 42. Claim 86 is similarly rejected under Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly.

As per dependent claim 87, Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 71, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant further discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 82. Claim 87 is similarly rejected under Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly.

As per dependent claim 88, Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant further discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 82. Claim 88 is similarly rejected under Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly.

As per dependent claim 89, Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 49, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant further discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 82. Claim 89 is similarly rejected under Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly.

As per dependent claim 91, Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 63, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant further discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 82. Claim 91 is similarly rejected under Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly.

7.   Claims 4-5, 33, and 73 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly and further in view of Eichstaedt et al. (U.S. 6,182,085).

As per dependent claim 4, Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Heddaya also discloses determining if additional pages should be prefabricated (column

8, lines 40-43) and prefabrication of pages (column 7, lines 10-11). However, Heddaya

and Smith does not disclose crawling a page. However, Eichstaedt discloses crawling a

page (Figure 3; column 5, lines 13-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly's method for

determining which pages to prefabricate and Heddaya's prefabrication method with

Eichstaedt's method of crawling pages since it would have allowed for pages linked to

the first prefabricated page to be prefabricated so that a user would have been able to

access pages more rapidly.

As per dependent claim 5, Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly, and Eichstaedt disclose

the limitation similar to those in claim 4 and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Heddaya also discloses the method in which a first page is prefabricated (column 7,

lines 10-11). Although Heddaya is silent on a start page, it is well known that a start

page is a type of page and is inherently included in Heddaya's method of page

prefabrication.

As per dependent claim 33, Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly disclose the

limitations similar to those in claim 23 and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Heddaya fails to disclose the system in which the prefabricator comprises a module to

crawl the first prefabricated page for additional pages to prefabricate. However,

Eichstaedt discloses crawling a page (Figure 3; column 5, lines 13-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly's system to prefabricate pages with Eichstaedt's method of crawling pages since it would have allowed for pages linked to the first prefabricated page to be prefabricated so that a user would have been able to access pages more rapidly.

As per dependent claim 72, Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 70, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant further discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 4. Claim 72 is similarly rejected under Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly, and Eichstaedt.

8.   Claims 6, 9, 19, 28, 36, 58-62, 64, 74, 76, and 90 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly and further in view of Reiche (U.S. 6,092,192).

As per dependent claim 6 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly disclose the limitation similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya also discloses packaging information into the first prefabricated page (column 3, lines 49-51). Heddaya fails to disclose the method further comprising querying a database for information and processing the information. However, Reiche discloses querying a database for information, processing the information, and using the processed information for pages (column 6, lines 26-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly's prefabrication

method with Reiche's method of querying a database, processing information, and using the processed information for pages, since it would have allowed for prefabricated processed information to be quickly accessible.

As per dependent claim 9 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya fails to disclose a definable prefabrication policy that applies to a specific user or class of users. However, Reiche discloses a policy of allowing a specific user or a class of users to see documents based upon user verification (column 6, lines 26-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya, Smith, and Copland's prefabrication policy with Reiche's policy of allowing a specific user or group of users access to certain document, since it would have allowed for user specific information to be displayed only to authorized users.

As per dependent claim 28 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 25, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya fails to disclose a user access parameter. However, Reiche discloses a policy of allowing a specific user or a class of users to see documents based upon user verification (column 6, lines 26-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly's policy of prioritizing a list of pages to prefabricate with Reiche's policy of allowing a specific user or group of users access to certain document, since it would have allowed for pages to

be prefabricated in order to ensure that users with certain permissions received pages

more quickly than other users.

As per dependent claim 36 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly disclose the limitations

similar to those in claim 23, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya

fails to disclose the system in which the computer application comprises a database

application. However, Reiche discloses a database application (column 5, lines 32-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly's system for

prefabricating information with Reiche's use of a database application, since it would

have allowed for information stored in the database to be prefabricated and available for

efficient access.

As per independent claim 58 Heddaya and Smith disclose a method for

prefabricating an information page comprising:

- Prefabricating a first page to produce a first prefabricated page (column 7, lines
  10-11)

- Receiving an information request from a user (column 7, lines18-24)

- Determining if the information request corresponds to the first page (column 7,
  lines 24-27)

- Providing the first prefabricated page if the information request corresponds to
  the first page (column 7, lines 24-27)

- Dynamically fabricating a second page if the information request corresponds to
  the second page (column 7, lines 42-45)

- Prefabrication wherein the prefabrication is not in response to a request for the first page by a user (Smith: Figures 3 and 4; column 5, line 56- column 6, line 18)

Heddaya and Smith fail to disclose the use of a session identifier when receiving an information request from a user and Heddaya also fails to disclose providing the first prefabricated page with the session identifier if the information request corresponds to the first page. However, Reiche discloses the use of "receiving an information request from a user having a session identifier" (column 4, lines 54-65). Reiche further discloses providing a page with the session identifier if the request is accepted (column 5, lines 1-4; column 6, lines 8-10 and lines 21-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya and Smith's method of prefabrication of information with Reiche's method of user verification and data integrity, since it would have allowed a server to verify that unauthorized users were not able to obtain sensitive information from a prefabricated document.

Further, Heddaya and Smith fail to specifically disclose the method wherein the act of prefabrication the page comprises querying a database to obtained cached data, processing the data received from the database, and packaging the information associated with the data in a prescribed format. However, Ganguly discloses the method wherein the act of prefabrication the page comprises querying a database to obtained cached data, processing the data received from the database, and packaging the information associated with the data in a prescribed format (Figure 3; column 7, lines 27-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya and Smith's method with Ganguly's method, since it would have allowed a user to more quickly access data.

As per dependent claim 59, Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly, and Reiche disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 58. Heddaya fails to disclose verifying the validity of a session identifier. However, Reiche discloses verification of a session identifier (column 5, lines 32-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly, and Reiche's method of prefabrication of information with Reiche's method of verification of a session identifier, since it would have allowed a server to verify that unauthorized users were not able to obtain sensitive information from a prefabricated document.

As per dependent claim 60, Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly, and Reiche disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 59. Heddaya discloses a message passing between network nodes (column 14, lines 4-7). Heddaya fails to disclose verifying the validity of the session identifier to one or more nodes. However, Reiche discloses verification of a session identifier (column 5, lines 32-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly, and Reiche's method of message passing between network nodes with Reiche's method of verification of session identifiers, since it would have allowed all nodes on a network to know that document requests from a specified session were valid.

As per dependent claim 61 Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly, and Reiche disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 58. Heddaya discloses prefabrication of a first page. Heddaya does not disclose the first page as a URL parameter. However, Reiche discloses a page as a URL parameter (column 5, lines 6-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly, and Reiche's method of page prefabrication to Reiche's method of using a URL parameter in order to verify a user, since it would have allowed for a redirection to be made either to or from a log-in server and thus allowing for user identification.

As per dependent claim 62 Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly, and Reiche disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 58. Heddaya discloses prefabrication of a first page. Heddaya does not disclose the first page as a cookie value. However, Reiche discloses using a cookie value (column 6, lines 5-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly, and Reiche's method of page prefabrication to Reiche's method of using a cookie value in order to verify a user, since it would have allowed for user to validate their identity a single time with relevant user identification stored in a cookie.

As per dependent claim 64 Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly, and Reiche disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 63, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya fails to disclose a method that applies to a specific user or class of users.

However, Reiche discloses a policy of allowing a specific user or a class of users to see documents based upon user verification (column 6, lines 26-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly, and Reiche's prefabrication policy with Reiche's policy of allowing a specific user or group of users access to certain document, since it would have allowed for user specific information to be displayed only to authorized users.

As per dependent claim 74, Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 70, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant further discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 6. Claim 74 is similarly rejected under Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly and Reiche.

As per dependent claim 76, Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 70, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant further discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 9. Claim 76 is similarly rejected under Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly and Reiche.

As per dependent claim 90, Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 58, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. The applicant further discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 82. Claim 90 is similarly rejected under Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly and Reiche.

9.   Claims 12 and 66 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly in further view of Lapstun et al. (U.S. 6,549,935).

As per dependent claim 12 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly disclose the limitation similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya fails to disclose a policy comprising an application identifier. However, Lapstun discloses an application identifier (column 17, lines 55-58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly's method with Lapstun's application identifier, since it would have allowed applications to be referenced by pages and other applications.

As per dependent claim 66 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly disclose the limitation similar to those in claim 63, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya fails to disclose a policy comprising an application for which a page should be prefabricated. However, Lapstun discloses an application identifier to identify applications (column 17, lines 55-58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly's policy with Lapstun's application identifier, since it would have allowed applications to be referenced by pages and other applications.

10.   Claims 16-17, 20, 69, and 79 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly in further view of Birnbaum (U.S. 5,797,128).

As per dependent claim 16 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya fails to disclose a definable prefabrication policy organized as a hierarchy of policies. However, Birnbaum discloses a system with a hierarchy of policies (column 4, lines 27-32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly's prefabrication policy with Birnbaum's hierarchy of policies, since it would have allowed for policy groups containing parents and children (Birnbaum: column 5, lines 60-63).

As per dependent claim 17 Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly, and Birnbaum disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 16, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Birnbaum also discloses the policy comprising a system policy (column 4, lines 27-32).

As per dependent claim 20 Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly and Birnbaum disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 16, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya also discloses the policy comprising a transient policy (column 8, lines 29-49).

As per dependent claim 69 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 63, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya fails to disclose parameters organized as a hierarchy of policies categories. However, Birnbaum discloses a system with a hierarchy of policies (column 4, lines 27-32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly's prefabrication

policy with Birnbaum's hierarchy of policies, since it would have allowed for policy

groups containing parents and children (Birnbaum: column 5, lines 60-63).

As per dependent claim 79, Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly discloses the

limitations similar to those in claim 70, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

The applicant further discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 16. Claim 79 is

similarly rejected under Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly and Birnbaum.

11.   Claim 18 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly and Birnbaum in further view of Lapstun et al. (U.S.

6,549,935).

As per dependent claim 18 Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly, and Birnbaum disclose the

limitation similar to those in claim 16, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.

Heddaya fails to disclose a policy comprising an application identifier. However,

Lapstun discloses an application identifier (column 17, lines 55-58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly and Birnbaum's

method with Lapstun's application identifier, since it would have allowed applications to

be referenced by pages and other applications.

12.   Claim 19 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly, and Birnbaum in further view of Reiche.

As per dependent claim 19 Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly, and Birnbaum disclose the
limitations similar to those in claim 16, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.
Heddaya fails to disclose a definable prefabrication policy that applies to a specific user
or class of users. However, Reiche discloses a policy of allowing a specific user or a
class of users to see documents based upon user verification (column 6, lines 26-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly, and Birnbaum's
prefabrication policy with Reiche's policy of allowing a specific user or group of users
access to certain document, since it would have allowed for user specific information to
be displayed only to authorized users.

13.   Claim 29 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly in further view of Genty et al. (U.S. 2002/0078165).

As per dependent claim 29 Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly disclose the limitations
similar to those in claim 25, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Heddaya
fails to disclose the system in which the module prioritizes the list of pages based upon
a page depth parameter. Genty discloses generating pages based upon page depth
(page 1, paragraph 0009).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
applicant's invention to have combined Heddaya, Smith, and Ganguly's system to
prioritize pages to generate with Genty's system of pre-fetching pages at various

depths, since it would have allowed for pages commonly visited by a user to be fetched

and stored for more rapid access (Genty: page 1, paragraph 0009).

Allowable Subject Matter

14.   Claims 95-96 and 98 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base

claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

15.   Applicant's arguments filed 28 May 2005 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

16.   Applicant's arguments, see Remarks filed 28 May 2008, with respect to claims

95-98 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 95-98

under 35 USC 103 has been withdrawn.

The applicant's arguments are based upon the amended limitation of, "the act of

prefabricating the first page comprises sending a request for information of the first

page wherein the request is transmitted at a rate based on system resource information

(pages 14-15)." Although the examiner agrees with the applicant's assessment that

neither Heddaya, Ganguly, nor Reiche disclose such a limitation (pages 14-15), the

examiner respectfully disagrees with the assessment that Smith fails to teach such a

limitation. Smith discloses sending a request for information of the page, wherein the request is transmitted at a rate based on system resource information (column 6, lines 19-60: Here, the user's system monitors a user's requests for data. Based upon the timing of the request, the system sends requests for data, and pre-caches the requested data when a user's phone is not being used, thereby avoiding interference with in coming or out going phone calls. This increases the transmission rate of obtaining the data, as the information request is less likely to be interrupted by phone traffic).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KYLE R. STORK whose telephone number is (571)272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kyle R Stork/
Kyle R Stork
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krs